

today requires material from several stages in the life history, an aggregate of specimens from such stages may be considered as holotype, lectotype, or neotype material. Endorsement of such an expanded definition of the term "type-specimen" is urged for zoologists working with species for which multiple specimen type material is both desirable and possible to obtain. This recommendation is appropriate for not only Article 72 but also Articles 73, 74 and 75.

THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF *LEPTOCLINUM LISTERIANUM*  
MILNE EDWARDS AS TYPE-SPECIES OF *DIPLOSOAMA* MACDONALD  
(ASCIDEACEA). Z.N.(S.) 1766

By F. W. E. Rowe (Zoology & Physiology Research Laboratory, Polytechnic of Central London)

I am much gratified that Dr. Mather (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 25 : 131) agrees with my proposals for suppression of *Leptoclinum* in favour of *Diplosoma*.

2. Regarding the selection of *listerianum* as type-species of *Diplosoma* in place of *rayneri*:

As indicated in my submission (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 23 : 247) and in my subsequent examination of relevant material (1966, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (13) 9 : 457-465) I agree with Lahille (1890) and have concluded that *Diplosoma rayneri* Macdonald 1859 and *Leptoclinum listerianum* Milne Edwards, 1841, are conspecific. The latter name, therefore takes priority. Thus either *listerianum* becomes type-species of *Diplosoma* or *Diplosoma* becomes a synonym of the genus which includes *listerianum* among its species; *rayneri* is the type-species of *Diplosoma* by monotypy. The only genus to which *listerianum* could belong is *Leptoclinum*, for which agreed suppression is being sought.

I therefore support my submission that *listerianum* should be selected as type-species of *Diplosoma* by suggesting that if *listerianum* is selected type-species of *Diplosoma* then at any future time, should any author consider that Lahille's (1890) and my (1966) conclusions, regarding the conspecificity of *rayneri* and *listerianum* insufficiently substantiated, then the generic name *Diplosoma* is unaffected. Should there be disagreement on this matter, then the status of *Diplosoma* may be uncertain, owing to the seniority of the name *listerianum*. Since *listerianum* will be without a generic connotation (*Leptoclinum* to be suppressed), it is unthinkable to refer it to a new genus, this merely adding to confusion since its priority over *rayneri* thus places *Diplosoma* in jeopardy again.

I firmly believe, therefore, that stability will be best achieved by the selection of *L. listerianum* Milne-Edwards as type-species of *Diplosoma* in place of *D. rayneri* Macdonald, 1859.

3. Regarding Dr. Mather's comments on the incidence of records of *rayneri* and *listerianum*, I feel that Dr. Mather refutes her own argument since the list of authors recording *listerianum* well outweighs those for *rayneri*; also *listerianum* is shown to have a wider geographical range.